

OPINION 611

PARAPENAEUS S. I. SMITH, 1885 (CRUSTACEA, DECAPODA); VALIDATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS AND INTERPRETATION OF *PENEUS MEMBRANACEUS* RISSO, 1816.

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers :—

- (a) the nominal species *Peneus membranaceus* Risso, 1816, is hereby identified with the nominal species *Peneus siphonoceros* Philippi, 1840¹;
- (b) the generic name *Parapenaeus* Claus, 1876, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of both the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonymy;
- (c) the specific name *cocco* Prestandrea, 1833, as published in the binomen *Peneus coco*, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified :

- (a) *Parapenaeus* S. I. Smith, 1885 (gender : masculine), type-species, by original designation, *Peneus longirostris* Lucas, 1846 (Name No. 1443);
- (b) *Solenocera* Lucas, 1849 (gender : feminine), type-species, by monotypy, *Peneus siphonoceros* Philippi, 1840 (Name No. 1444).

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified :

- (a) *longirostris* Lucas, 1846, as published in the binomen *Peneus longirostris* (type-species of *Parapenaeus* Smith, 1885) (Name No. 1762);
- (b) *membranaceus* Risso, 1816, as published in the binomen *Peneus membranaceus*, and to be interpreted by the neotype designated by L. B. Holthuis in the present Opinion (Name No. 1763).

(4) The generic name *Parapenaeus* Claus, 1876 (as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above) is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name No. 1519.

(5) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified :

- (a) *cocco* Prestandrea, 1833, as published in the binomen *Peneus coco* (as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(c) above) (Name No. 671);
- (b) *philippii* Lucas, 1849, as published in the binomen *Solenocera philippii* (a junior objective synonym of *Peneus siphonoceros* Philippi, 1840) (Name No. 672).

(6) The following family-group names are hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified :

¹ Had the Code as amended at the XVth International Congress of Zoology, 1958, been published when this case was submitted to the Commission this action under the plenary powers would have been unnecessary, a neotype designation for *Peneus membranaceus* being sufficient for the desired result.

(a) PARAPENAEINAE (correction by Ortmann, 1898, of PARAPENAEINA)
Wood-Mason & Alcock, 1891 (type-genus *Parapenaeus* S. I. Smith,
1885) (Name No. 308);

(b) SOLENOCERINAE (correction by Ortmann, 1898, of SOLENOCERINA)
Wood-Mason & Alcock, 1891 (type-genus *Solenocera* Lucas, 1849)
(Name No. 309).

(7) The following family-group names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Numbers specified :

(a) PARAPENAEINA Wood-Mason & Alcock, 1891 (type-genus *Parapenaeus*
S. I. Smith, 1885) (an incorrect original spelling for PARAPENAEINAE)
(Name No. 340);

(b) SOLENOCERINA Wood-Mason & Alcock, 1891 (type-genus *Solenocera*
Lucas, 1849) (an incorrect original spelling for SOLENOCERINAE)
(Name No. 341).

HISTORY OF THE CASE (Z.N.(S.) 645)

The present case was submitted to the Secretary of the Commission by Dr. L. B. Holthuis in February 1952. It was sent to the printer on 14 July 1959 and was published on 8 April 1960 in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 17 : 199–202. Public Notice of the possible use by the Commission of its plenary powers in the present case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the other prescribed serial publications (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 51–56). Support for Dr. Holthuis's proposals was expressed by Dr. R. Zariquey (Barcelona, Spain).

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 1 December 1960 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (60)25 either for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 17 : 201–202. At the close of the Voting Period on 1 March 1961 the state of the voting was as follows :

Affirmative Votes—twenty-three (23), received in the following order : Holthuis, Riley, Hering, Mayr, Vokes, Lemche, Kühnelt, Bonnet, Dymond, Obruchev, Brinck, Jacewski, Prantl, Key, Alvarado, Boschma, Hemming, Stoll, do Amaral, Mertens, Poll, Bradley, Evans.

Negative Votes—none (0).

Late affirmative votes were returned by Commissioners Miller, Uchida and Tortonese.

Two Commissioners enclosed comments with their voting papers as follow :

Dr. K. H. L. Key (12.i.61) : "I enclose Voting paper (60)25 with an affirmative vote.

"Assuming that the Commission as a whole votes this way the question arises as to the method by which it is to 'identify' the species *membranaceus* with the species *siphonoceros*. The identification of species is a taxonomic judgment, which cannot be directly the concern of the Commission. It seems

to me that all the Commission can do is to take such action within the nomenclatural field as will inevitably lead a taxonomist to identify the two species with each other. What this action should be must depend, I think, on the type situation. If types of both nominal species were in existence and were adjudged conspecific, then presumably no action on the part of the Commission would be required. If types of both nominal species were in existence and were adjudged specifically distinct, or if the type of only *siphonoceros* were in existence, then the Commission could declare the appropriate type to be the type of both species. If, as seems probable in this case (the applicant has nothing to say on the type situation), type material of neither species is extant, the Commission could simply declare *siphonoceros* to be a junior objective synonym of *membranaceus* and rule that the latter is to be interpreted in accordance with the original description of the former.

"It should be noted that merely to declare the two species objective synonyms, without specifying which original description is to be diagnostic, could, in the hands of a Heller, lead merely to the synonymisation of *siphonoceros* (via *membranaceus*) with *longirostris*.

"Another possibility would be to select for *membranaceus* a neotype that would guarantee its interpretation in the sense of *siphonoceros*. This would be in one sense a less radical course, because, unless the neotype were simultaneously designated neotype of *siphonoceros* (a procedure contrary to the principle of neotype designation), the latter name would remain available, for instance as a subspecific name.

"I recommend that the applicant be asked to review these considerations and to advise the Commission as to the machinery which, in light of the actual type situation, would in his view be most appropriate for bringing about the identity that he desires."

Dr. A. do Amaral (6.ii.61): "Solenocera is a Latinized noun, from the Greek $\sigma\omega\lambda\eta\nu o-s + \kappa\epsilon\rho\alpha s$ ($\sigma\omega\lambda\eta\nu o\kappa\epsilon\rho\alpha s$ would be neuter in Greek). Should it have been simply transliterated into Latin, it would be neuter (*Solēnocērās*). But as a Latinized noun (*Solēnocērā*) it has become feminine (1st decl.) as per Copenhagen Decision 84(3)."

Commissioner do Amaral is quite correct in attributing the feminine gender to *Solenocera*, under the Copenhagen Rule cited. The Ruling in the present Opinion has therefore been corrected on this point.

Commissioner Key's comment was forwarded to the applicant, Dr. Holthuis, who in replying agreed that a neotype selection for Risso's species would be a more elegant and simpler solution, and agreed to make such a selection. Dr. Holthuis's designation is made in the Appendix below.